

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, and 10 stand rejected as obvious over 6,629,533 in view of GOODE 6,406,453.

Claims 6 and 9 stand rejected as obvious in further view of LEIB 5,318,513.

FIG.6a





FIG.7



The Official Action would modify the Figure 7 eye plug of WEBB in view of the Figure 1 ear ventilation tube of GOODE.

As an initial matter, GOODE is non-analogous to WEBB in that medical field of the ears is separated from the medical field of the eyes.




FIG.11

GOODE Figure 11 shows the branches 14 of the T tube 12 extending behind a membrane in a space deprived from surrounding tissues and then acting as a stop in a void space. This makes no suggestion, absent hindsight, concerning a smooth functional retaining means appropriate against tissues of the lachrymal channel.

The Official Action states that GOODE teaches two legs 40, 42 (branches 14) that extend outwardly to retain the implant in place. The Official Action states that this teaching would motivate one of skill to modify WEBB to have two legs (diverging branches) that extend outwardly to retain the WEBB device in place.

As the Official Action notes, WEBB teaches that the anchoring leg 538 extends towards the top collar 518.

Therefore, if a second leg 538 were added to WEBB, the second leg would also extend towards the top collar.

In the invention, the branches extend away from the top collar. See application Figures 1 and 9.

Further, claim 1 recites wherein said two branches are elastically connected to said first section in order [that said two branches] to be biased each branch against the other branch If WEBB were modified as proposed, the branches would extend upward and could not be biased, each branch against the other branch.

Therefore, the invention as recited does not result.

There is no teaching in the applied references suggesting this geometry, whereby the surgeon knowing the direction of the plane of the branches movement when diverging into the canaliculus, can adjust the angular orientation of the plug around its general axis for meeting the orientation of the natural canaliculus which is collapsed on an antero-posterior plane.

In claim 7, the modified WEBB device would not provide two branches biased each branch against the other branch, the two branches during insertion into the meatus being brought together under action of an injector appliance for locating the plug into the meatus.

In the modified WEBB device the two branches would always be separated by the elongate body 512 so that two branches biased would be biased against the elongate body 512 and not biased each branch against the other branch, and the two branches during insertion into the meatus would be brought against the elongate body and not be brought together.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Roland E. Long, Jr. Reg. No. 41,949
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

REL/lad